



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/050,454	01/16/2002	Bhanwar Singh	F0604	6532

23623 7590 04/03/2003

AMIN & TUROCY, LLP  
1900 EAST 9TH STREET, NATIONAL CITY CENTER  
24TH FLOOR,  
CLEVELAND, OH 44114

EXAMINER

TRINH, HOA B

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2814

DATE MAILED: 04/03/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/050,454

Applicant(s)

SINGH ET AL.

Examiner

Vikki H Trinh

Art Unit

2814

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on, \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 13-20 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 2.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Election/Restrictions***

1. Applicant's election of group I, claims 1-12, in Paper No. 5 is acknowledged. Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election **without** traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)).

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

### ***Specification***

1. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

### **Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103**

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2814

2. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

3. Claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moslehi (5,270,222) in view of Ritzdorf et al. (6,508,920).

Moslehi (5,270,222) discloses a processing chamber 248 to form a substrate/wafer 124 with insulating layers and an x-ray scattering measurement system 214 for measuring in-situ the parameters of the substrate, in particular the thickness of a semiconductor substrate and insulating layer. See figures 2, 15, 20- 22. (The examiner notes that “ a library of signatures corresponding to various thickness” is the same as “parameters” of the semiconductor device.)

However, Moslehi does not explicitly teach that the chamber is for forming a substrate with a trench, a barrier layer, and a seed layer.

Ritzdorf et al. (6,508,920) discloses a process chamber 35, 110 to form a seed layer 425 over a barrier layer 423, the barrier layer formed conformal to a trench 420, sidewalls 430, and to a substrate 400 located in the chamber, wherein the trench is formed in the substrate, and a processing station or controlling system 10 for controlling the parameter of the substrate. See

Art Unit: 2814

figures 1-2G. (The examiner notes that “ a library of signatures corresponding to various thickness” is the same as “parameters” of the semiconductor device.)

Therefore, with respect to claims 1, 3, 7-11, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to construct the substrate of Moslehi with trench, barrier layer, and seed layer, as taught by Ritzdorf et al., so as to form a damascene structure.

The courts have concluded that there is no requirement that a motivation to make the modification be expressly articulated. The test for combining references is what the combination of disclosures taken as a whole would suggest to one of ordinary skill in the art. In re McLaughlin, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971). Also, references are evaluated by what they suggest to one versed in the art, rather than by their specific disclosures. In re Bozek, 163 USPQ 545 (CCPA 1969).

As to claim 2, Moslehi teaches a control system 12 for controlling the operating characteristics of the formation environment within the chamber. See figure 1.

As to claim 4, Moslehi shows the measurement system 214 is an x-ray reflectometry system 214. See figures 7-9.

As to claims 5-6, Moslehi shows a polychromatic x-ray light source for generating a spectrum of incident angles and a detector 182, 150, 160, 166, 178 to measure the intensity of the reflected x-rays as a function of an angles. See figure 9.

As to claim 12, Ritzdorf et al. '920 shows that the seed layer 440 is copper . See column 6, lines 35-40.


Art Unit: 2814

### Conclusion

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Vikki Trinh whose telephone number is (703) 308-8238. The Examiner can normally be reached Mon-Tuesday, Thurs-Friday, 7:30 AM - 6:00 PM Eastern Time. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Mr. Wael Fahmy, can be reached at (703) 308-4918. General inquiries relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist at (703) 308-0858. The fax number is (703) 308-2708.



Vikki Trinh,  
Patent Examiner  
AU 2814



SUPERVISORY PRIMARY EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2000